P. F. 46 of 94

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1893-94

192 .

(L. R.)

File No. 95 of 93

Serial Nos. 1-9

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 9

Fijian Part B for October 1876.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkatramiah regarding his suspension from the Chandragiri office of Tirumalas.

~~Assistant General.~~

Countermarked

WD 233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

(1) Petn 3588 of 93-94

Appellant

Venkataramiah
Shanbag of
Kirenellur

This is an appeal against the order of the Dy Commr, Kadur, dismissing Petr for a period of ten years for his misconduct in connection with the disposal of Dharkast for S. Nos 100 and 139 of the village.

S. No	Extent	Rent
100 (dry).	16 Acres 35 guntas	Rs 12-8
139 (dry)	9 Acres 5 guntas	Rs 6.

Survey No 100.

One Gidda Naika presented a Dharkast for this land in the Taluq Cutcherry on 1 August 92. This was sent on to the Dharkhastdar Appaji Rao with direction to put Shanbag

(3)

His the Shanbag failed to do.

The charge against the Shanbag, so far as his land is concerned, that he intentionally abstained from placing the matter before the Jamabandy officer with a view to help Hoocha belonging to his party and to cause loss to Malla belonging to the opposite party headed by Shanbague Venkatakrishnaish.

After the close of the year, the Dy Commr ordered the land to be given to Malla (the appellee) and this was confirmed by Govt (Vide Endorsement 1855 dated 17 July 1894)

Survey No 139 (H)

Agasala Malla presented
two dharkasts to the
Talug Cutcherry for the
land on 11 August 92
and 12 September 92
respectively

It is alleged that
the dharkast of 11 August
92 was sent to the Shanbogue
on 10 Sep 92 by post to
adyampur (his residence)
directing him to put
Malla in possession for
Ekkal Cultivation.
The Shanabog denies
receipt of the dharkast.

On receipt of the
2 dharkast Takeed no
2057 dated 12 September 92
was issued to the Shanbogue
to the same effect and
it is alleged it was
despatched on 22 September 1892

Order in possession for
Ekrad Cultivation.
On the 30th September 1892
the Sheikh had returned
the Chaukadi to the Taluq-
Cutcherry, representing that
he was unable to put
Applicant in possession
of the land as the Vendor
had not been given in
the Chaukadi

One Hooka presented
a Chaukadi for the Same
land by the Chankapa (Applicant)
on 12th October 1892. Shanbhoga
Granted the application,
put Hooka in possession
and reported the matter
to the Taluq Cutcherry
The Taluq office Sent the
Chaukadi of both Malla and
Hooka to the Shanbog
with directions that they
should be placed before
the Jamabandy officer for disposal

(15)

The Shanbag says he received this on the 27 September 1892, whereas it ought to have reached him on the 25 September. It is alleged The Shanbag ~~offered to have~~ altered the date of receipt of the from 23rd to 27 September, with an object.

One Soma applied to the Shanbogue for this land on 20 September The Shanbag put him in possession on 25th September

... On the 19 October 1892, the Shanbag reported to the Talug that he did not receive the first Mahazar of Mallu, that he received his second Mahazar after Soma was put in possession and that Mallu's application

did not give the
survey number of the land (6)

The Charges against
the Shanbag, Sofar
as this land is concerned
are

(1) that he falsely
denied receipt of
the first Charkat
of Malka

(2) that he intentionally
altered the date of
receipt of the second
Charkat from 23 September
to 27 September,
with a view to make it
appear that it was
received after Some
one was put in possession

(3) that the Shanbag
failed to bring the
matter to the notice
of the Jamabandy officer

(9) to help his team and to cause to graze belonging to the opposite faction (3) that on the 27 Sep he should not have allowed some Cutter upon the land.

The dates 23 Sep appears to have been altered to 27 September (vide 2 in File of the Proceedings)

Appellant was fined Rs 20 in 1888 } for Rs 20 in 1890 } for having exposed the right of grazing on S. No 91 of Mr Carvalho without permission. The second time he was informed that if he

(5)

M No 3588 of 1893-94

Petitioner
in Kataramale
of Hereyanallee
Kadur Taluq
Kadur Dt.
represented by his G
Srinivasa Iyengar.

Petitioner appeals against the order dated
of the Dy Commr suspending him from office
for a period of 10 years. —

Petitioner was suspended because he
was found guilty of (1) having altered
the date of receipt of a Darkast so as to
favour another applicant, (2) having denied
the receipt of a Darkast sent to him by the
Amildar & (3) having failed to bring the
matter of the Darkast above referred to to the
notice of the Samabandz Mr as he was
directed to do. — The Records clearly

shew that Petitioner was guilty of the several charges brought against him, & considering the gravity of the 1st charge, i.e. of altering the dates on a Public document, he should have been dismissed from office - The Govt however will not interfere with the decision of the Dy Comm - The appeal is dismissed -

Petitioner requests that his son ~~brother~~ or some other relative of his might be appointed in his place. This is a matter which must be left to the discretion of the Dy Comm

LCP
25/9194

(10)

Mr is informed that his appeal has been dismissed

LCP

(8)

his African friend Jacky
& my German Charge
he would be dismissed
from Service. He &
Captain Ca Kenyon
Mansfield, Affiliated
for the long friend
of ten years.

(Note -

General Serial No. 32.)

189/4

(2)

No. 3588

Name of Petitioner. Venkatapuramma...

Village. Ajjampur

Taluk. Kadur

District. do

Date of Arzi.

Date of Receipt. 28-6-94.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One

(11)

Rect. 6/7.

d. 2. 45' 93-1

Subd. Council

In time

Tehsildar's Counterfoil

D.J. 11/7

Petitioner appears this day.

Adj to 5/8/94

5/8/94

This is a petition on behalf of the minor son of Venkatapuramma of Ajjampur praying that the Tehsildar may be directed to grant him a certificate of guardianship to the property of his deceased father Venkatappa Gowda of the same village and for such other and further orders as to this Court may seem meet.

Adj to 5/8/94

5/8/94

ABSTRACT.

One Bhadrachalla Gowda of Ajjampur applied for the land A. No: 183 of Hirisavalli village on the 20th September 1893. He petitioned the Thanadar of the village, after settling the differences of the people, granted the said land to the Petitioner on the pretence of his having cultivated for the year 1893-94 and collected the assessment thereon and also the Govt. Revenue upto the 6th instant. Subsequently the Petitioner died and his widow Venkatapuramma applied for the land on the 28th June 1894 and prayed that the same may be granted to her minor son. The Petitioner has also applied for a certificate of guardianship to the property of the deceased.

2. After two days after the application was made the Tehsildar issued a notice on 29-9-93, to the villagers, and in the absence of objections received, granted the land to the Petitioner on 12-10-93 for the year 1893-94.

3.

(13)

11. The Deputy Commissioner says as stated in his order, for this that I have guilty, are not found.

12. There is nothing to show that Govind Kutcha belong to his pargs. This is only a conjecture of the Amildar.

13. Goldsmith Mallia's dark that actually reached him on 27th September 1892. He never changed a dated. If he was actually in the wrong he would have checked them only instead of confirming the dark last of Govind.

14. He was not disobedient to the Amildar during jamabandy time. He submitted all the papers to the Amildar at that time as required. So the charge of disobedience on him is groundless.

15. As he has been already punished for his past mistakes, it is unlawful now to punish him again for the past mistakes.

16. The Deputy Commissioner's order which is based on the Amildar's report written against him (pet.) was made to screen himself, is unjust.

17. It is unjust to debar his practicing from looking after the duties of his office after he is retired on pension.

18. So, after enquiry, his punishment may be cancelled & his appointment may be restored to him.

Prays that pending the disposal of this appeal in this office, the Deputy Commissioner's order may be held in abeyance.

[illegible]

The order appealed against is as follows. —

"It is known that the Shanbhog Venkataramiah espoused the lands to Hutcha + Lowa who belong to his party + that the 1st Daikhastdar Pallaiah + Thalla are of his opposite party.

1. The Shanbhog says that he did not receive the order, dated 10-9-92, of the Amildar, on Goldsmith Thallaiah's darkhast.
2. That although the Amildar's second order no. 205 reached him on 23-9-92, he has changed the date to 27-9-92, which he admits. Perhaps he changed this date to show delay in the Amildar's order + thus to grant the lands to Lowa on 25-9-92.
3. The Shanbhog's conduct is very suspicious as he did not obey the Amildar's order + as he did not produce the records connected before the Amildar, during Jamabandy time.
4. The Shanbhog has really committed many mistakes one of them being his not replying to the Amildar till 19-10-92. for the order received on 23-9-92.

This Shanbhog had been previously fined often times + in the end, Col. Campbell had ordered to warn him that he would be dismissed if found fault with again. As he did not take care to rectify himself according to Col: Campbell's order + has again committed faults, he is suspended for 10 years. Some one who is not an undivided member of his family should be chosen for his place + reported + after sanction, the duties should be taken from him as Govt's servant.

As the Sheikdar Appaji Rao is also concerned in this matter in being indifferent throughout, in causing delay, he is fined Rs 5/, which should be recovered from him."

(12)

he refused, on the 4th October 1892, the
matter of his address by granting the said
land for cultivation & tenure.

The delay in his reply was caused entirely through
his indifference, but the said Goldsmith
Maitland had not ordered the occupation of
the land in his declaration & the name thereof
he (who) sent for.

Then the commissioner ordered him to produce
the two declarations with all the papers connected
before him during the said time;
he gave a full and perfect receipt to the Auditor
on the 4th November 1892.

On 6th February 1893, the Auditor, after
enquiry, completed the land to Louis
& granted a perpetual right to him through
the petitioner since then Louis is in
the occupation of the said number.

On the 1st March the petitioner Jacobs
appealed to the Deputy Commissioner, for
which the Deputy Commissioner ordered 11th July 1893.
the Auditor to grant the said land
to the said Jacobs at the end of July 1894.

The said Louis another Native today lodged
a counter appeal to this office against
the said order of the Deputy Commissioner.

When the Petitioner & Respondent were called
for, the Auditor in order to shield
himself & the irregularities in the Taluk,
drew all the blame on him (petr) & took
to the Deputy Commissioner with bad
remarks of his proceedings & conduct.

The Deputy Commissioner, without
knowing the merits of the case, & without
holding any enquiry at all, concluded that
he (petr) was guilty & passed the required
order, confirming that of the Asst Collr.

* 10th of April 1894.

(6.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894.

From The Deputy Com
Hadur Division
Pet 115—

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 14 8

Despatched 15 th August

Received

Enclosures No. 2 & 2 files

General No.
No. 80
1894-95

Submitting entire proceedings connected with the suspension of Venkatramania, Shanbhog of Hirenallur, Hadur Taluk.

Pet. Branch
17/8/94

Rec'd
18/8

Issue to be prepared
Yes.
Noted 20 September.
Issue notice to Pet. only
21/8
Issued
22/8/94.

L.R. 95-93-3

(17)

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Hadur District

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

As called for in his official Memo
No 198/Rev dated 5th August 1894, forwarding
petition from Venkatramania, Shanbhog
of Hirenallur of the Hadur Taluk, ap-
pealing against Mr Shanks's order sus-
pending him for 10 years, has the
honor to submit the entire proceedings
connected with the case as per Index
attached hereto.

The appeal petition with its enclo-
sure is herewith returned.

Off Deputy Commr
Hadur District

Ex. 198 ✓

6-8-94.

(15)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(3)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L.R. 95-93-2

The accompanying Petition No. 3593 ~~dated~~ received at the Dewan's Office from Venkataramaiah Pantgue of Hirinallur reading an appeal against Dy. Comm's order No 1134 dated 18 Jan 1894 confirming his proceedings is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Dy. Commr. Kadur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case to this Office on or before 20 inst.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By Order,

Draft 6/8/94

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 5/6 1894

6/6.

SVR. 6/6.

M.G.C.P. Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

Précis.

(18)

Kadur Taluk

Hirenallur Village

No titles on this land.

Survey No. 37, Assessed 9 acres and 5 guntas, assessed at Rs 6/-

No Talcadi titles on this land.
There is only, cultivated pani-table land.

2. Survey No. Partition Ry Extent 9 acres 35 guntas, assessed at Rs 5/2

1. Ayaki Malla applied for No. 39 on 2nd September 1892

Mysore Govt claim 1/100

2 Siddana Malla applied for No. 39 on 1st August 1892

Both of them presented their claims to the Talui Kacheri.

3. Same applied for Survey No. 39 on 2nd September 1892.

4. Kenda applied for Survey No. 39 on 2nd October 1892.

Both of them presented their claims before the Village Chauvage and

(20)

6 The Deputy Commissioner having according to existing rules applied for the orders of Government in favour of the first applicant, the Government directs that the Deputy Commissioner may dispose of the case on its merits leaving the party aggrieved to appeal to Government in due course, and that Amildar's Explanation in justification of his action should be obtained and recorded in the Proceedings. Vide Chief Secretary's Docket No. 279/42 dated 7th July 1893.

On 11th July 1893, the Amildar was directed to submit his explanation and to allow the subsequent applicants

and received his permission to cultivate the lands on Likoola terms under the Government Proceedings No. 1374-81 dated the 5th August 1892. Rec 309.92

5 On 8th February 893, the Calif Chenistalan Lubbanna (and not the Amilalan) having passed orders confirming the lands to the subsequent applicants ignoring the claims of the first applicants and thereafter this claiming been granted to them on 5th February 1893, the first applicants viz S. Malia and E. Malia complained to the Sinadandy Officer and to the Deputy Commissioner against the Amilalan orders.

Vide Amilalan's report No. 2256 dated 9th May 93 regretting the Chiefdom to Amilalan - in which it is stated that a general list together with the papers was forwarded before him, and the land confirmed to Ingela and Lama in consideration of their having spent some money on them

that it should be con-
firmed to him
as he would be a great
loss if he be deprived
of the same
Note - No appeal seems
to have been received
from Dera in respect
of Survey No. 39.

Memo No. 234 of 30.1.44
7.2.44.

The Government
having called ~~for~~
~~Note & stated their~~
~~views~~ for the proceedings
~~Order~~ for the proceedings
on the subject, the
Collector was given
orders to submit the
Memorandum as follows:-
The Collector states:-
I, by Medical Certificate,
which received the Govt
Memo on the 13th August
1943, was sent to the
Sterling Civil Hospital
for in-patient treatment
for Cataract (for
same) for about a

In respect of Survey
No. 39. Taluka

cultivation under the
orders then in
force. Though there were
sufficient information
given in the application
to identify the land
(No: not mentioned
in the application),
yet the Chief Clerk failed
to stay the said orders,
but reported that he
had not the village
map (Report dated 30th
September, 1921).

This is the mistake
of refusing Christian
applicants Rs.
The Christian Citizen"
2 Cr, 2nd October 1921
who had applied for the
above number before
the Chairman Venkat-
ramania, who granted
the same to him, for-
bidden cultivation, and
reported the same to
the Collector.

(24)

by Shailaja and Veeraraghavan to the Chancery Court of Tanjore with notice to produce them for final orders at the time of Judgment. When did the Judgment-debtors, the parties concerned, receive the

(The initial date:-

Since received the 3rd Sept. 1928

(1) Shailaja gave an application on the 3rd August 1928 to the Court to receive the 3rd Sept. 1928 (the day) with notice to hand over the land to the appointed Receiver.

The Judgment-debtors about the correctness of this statement in the Counter-affidavit denied of their having received it.

(2) Again on 5th Sept.

in

in his application on 12th September 1892, on which day a Patteel (No. 2354) was issued to the Chandrange directing him to hand over the land to the applicant for Ektara cultivation, if he was the only one applying for it. The date specified noted in the Patteel seems to have been altered from 23rd to 27th September 1892.

(3) In the meanwhile one Lama put in his application before the Chandrange on 23rd September 1892, for Chunee No. 139) this land, which he (Chandrange) granted to him for Ektara cultivation on the 25th September 1892.

Though it be considered that 27th September 1892, which appears

(26)

appears to have been
attested by the Chancellor
was the actual date on
which he received Patent
No 2357, pertaining to
him of Victoria Lanthas
three dis ex[illegible] days dif
ference between (1) the
day on which he gained
the land and (2) the
day on which he received
the said Patent. In the
2nd Section Sec 8, the
Ordinance does fully
ensure that the Civil Servant
who the first applicant
and that same the
Surveyor applicant
was not to get the land.
He should have with-
drawn his ... mission
from Land, made
necessary records, in-
structed that not to
enter upon the land
and reported the matter
for orders to the Land

in

promptly to collect the 20s. on Matlias' dankhast. Instead of this he kept himself quiet from 27th September 1892 till 7th October 1892 on which date he submitted a Supplemental report—

(1) Of not having received Matlias original dankhast sent to him by post,

(2) Of not having the village map with him to enable him to carry out the orders given to him on Matlias' 2nd dankhast,

(3) Of Matlias not having attended before him though present for him 2 or 3 times,

(4) Of his having already handed over the field to Lama and

(5) Of that Lama having already plowed the land.

It is apparent from the Chandengi proceedure

(30)

Venkatramayya to
union. Each and every
belong. There exist
congeniality between
these parties. Changing
Venkatramania has
committed many in-
regularities and given
the land in question
to this man to the preju-
dice of the other men
who belong to the other
Changing.

The United States
States:-

2. There are no charges
against the Changing
Venkatramania-

(1). He failed to submit
the papers relating to
the farm contract to
produce the parties
concerned, though re-
quired, before me at
the time of my Jama-
bandi which was a
very good occasion
to

the 2nd application from A Mallia was despatched on the 22nd idem and should have reached him on the 23rd idem. It would appear that he first entered '23rd' and then altered the same to '27th' to suit his own convenience.

As in the case of No 100, the records relating to No 139 sent back to the Shanbogue for production at Jemalumdi did not also come up before me at the time of my Jemalumdi.

The Amildar states:-

1. Kinenallur village contains 2 factions, one is headed by Shanbogue Venkatakrishnaiya to whom A Mallia and G Malla belong and the other is headed by Shanbogue Venkatnarainappa

(28)

procedure that
has convinced him
with land and a
loaned him to cultiva
the land till the 19th
October 1892.

Under these circum
stances, I presume tha
the Shanbange attend
the date of the receipt
of the Vakeel above re-
ferred to to convince
him to dispose of Lama's
dankhast in preference
to that of A Mallia.
The Shanbange's denial
of the receipt of my
order on the original
dankhast of Mallia
sent to him by post
strengthens the above
presumption. If the
cover containing the
above order was not
delivered to him it
should have come back
to me. The Vakeel dated
12th September 1892 on

to recall the dispute and settle the case.

(2) He has concealed the means of selling to Chatterji a piece of land sent to him by post. His statement that he did not receive the cover is not tenable, as if it were true, the cover should have come back to the Calcutta office when it was posted to Rajarajpur where the landscape ordinarily resides. It may be inferred that he has some motive in this denial.

(3) He has altered the date of receipt of the letter on it. Whether 2nd Accountant as it may have received the change on the day next to 22nd September or earlier it was posted

to

(32)

to him to Adjampur and as there is no reason to imagine that the Adjampur Postal authorities delayed the delivery of the cover till the 27th September 92 from the 23rd idem on which date the cover reached the Post office. The Shanbhog being the permanent resident of Adjampur he is suspected as having altered the date himself.

(4) He should not have allowed Lama to enter upon the land granted to him by him (as he should have applied for taking orders on the 27th September 92 granting it to be the date on which he received it)

2 The Amildar states:-

If this case which

was

was not disposed of at the Jemadumdi had been brought to my notice before the Shirestadar passed his final ordens in the matter, I might have gone into the case better.

3. Loma and Hoocha who sowed the lands at the connivance of the Shanbongue have been served with the notices directing them to give up the lands as the harvest is over.

4. Though A Mallia and G Malla are the 1st applicants to these lands, yet it must be taken to consideration the labor rendered by Hoocha and Loma to the lands. If they are granted to the 1st applicants the subsequent

(34)

subsequent application may find it a great hardship to put them after enjoying them for some time, at the Chancery's convenience.

Under the circumstances, I am of opinion that if the two Courts in dispute are related to the said Juvenile Action it would meet all ends.

5. The Juvenile Courts Act. — I beg to submit Chancery Entertainments' explanation.

He has been punished twice prior to this. One 5/- fine in 1883. Again 5/- fine in 1893, for having Cruelly enjoyed for 4 or 5 years thereafter opportunity or so, in the Village. It is also stated in the order

order of 30 that if any
more serious charges
is framed against him,
he would be liable to
dismissal. (Vide copy
of orders No 1 dated
23rd June, 89.)

The Magistrate further
adds: —

6. In the present case
the Chamargaine
atrocities have been
already described and
he has proved himself
unworthy of confidence.
His statement that
Government records
did not reveal a delin-
quent in, and gives
much against him.
I beg to suggest that
this Chamargaine be
dealt with such pun-
ishment as may
be considered fair
for his abuse

(25)

Chamargaine further
in Page 4 of the
Chamargaine of 7
charges. He states
that he has been
Chamargaine for the
last 25 years.

(36) abonnements irrégularités.

Mlle Perlès

Rad. à la Commission

Kadur P.

Enclosure I (34)
ತಾರೀಖ 11-94

(1)

Two Rupees stamp affixed

THE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
No. 35888/R
18-6-94

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಅಸಾಧಾರಣ ಸಾಂಖ್ಯಿಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕಮಿಷನರರವರಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುವ ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಢೀಕರಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಉಳಿದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

1892ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಜನವರಿ 20ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಂದು ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 139ನೇ ನಂಬರ್‌ನ ಮೂಲಕ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಸಾಧಾರಣ ಸಾಂಖ್ಯಿಕ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕಮಿಷನರರವರು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

2- ನಾಗರಿಕ ಸೇವೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು

(38)

(39)

40)

12-

13-

14-

15-

16-

(41) 17 -

18 -

No. (42) (6)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

189

Endorsement granted to Venkatanarah Kadur Dt
Hirigaelleer, Kadur Taluq,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 3588 ~~dated~~ received on the 18 June 1894 appealing against the ~~the~~ Dy Comrs order dated 18 April 1894 suspending him for a period of ten years from the thanadar of the above village

~~Petitioner is informed that~~

Petitioner is informed that his appeal has been dismissed.

Enclosure is returned.

13/6/1894

L.R. 95-93-4

"By Order"

22/6

Chief Secretary.

4/6

M. G. C. P., Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

3-11-94

(7)

3588. 43

L.R. 95.93.15

31/10

(8)

(44)

L.R. 95-93-6

Petn 3588 of 1893-94

Petitioner

Venkataramiah

Shanbagar of Hiriyanallur,

Kadur Taluq,

Kadur Dt

represented by Mr

L Srinivasaraya

Petitioner appeals against the order of the Deputy Commr dated 18 April 1894 suspending him from office for a period of 10 years.

Petitioner was suspended because he was found guilty of (1) having altered the date of receipt of a Dharkast for Rs 139

presented by Malla
from 23rd to 27 September
1892 in view to
favouring one Sonna
another applicant
for the same number
(2) having denied the
receipt of another Blanket
for the same number
presented by Malla
and sent to him by
the Amildar
(3) having failed to bring
the matter of the Blankets
above referred to
and those for survey to
100 to the notice
of the Jamabandy officer
as he was directed
to do.

The Records

(8)

(44)

L.R. 95-93-6

Petn 3588 of 1893-94

Petitioner

Venkataramiah

Shanbagar of Hiriyanallur,

Kadur Taluq,

Kadur Dt

represented by Mr

L Srinivasaraya

Petitioner appeals against the order of the Deputy Commr dated 18 April 1894 suspending him from office for a period of 10 years.

Petitioner was suspended because he was found guilty of (1) having altered the date of receipt of a Dharkast for Rs 139

clearly show that
Petitioner was guilty
of the several charges
brought against him
And Considering
Gravity of the first offence,
i.e. of altering the
dates on a Public
document, he should
have been dismissed
from office. The Governor
however will not
interfere with the
decision of the Deputy
Commissioner. The
Appeal is dismissed.

Petitioner requests
that his Son or some other
relative might be appointed
in his place. This is a
Matter which must be

Rao

Please put up the file as pending.

48

189

No. 748

Name of Petitioner, Venkatgiriappa son of Shamboge Venkat-kamanna

Village, Ajjampura

Taluk, Kadur

District, Kadur

Date of Arzi, 24-8-96

Date of Receipt, 25-8-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 2

ABSTRACT.

Pet. appeals against the order of the Dy Comr Kadur No 438 of 26/5/96 in rejg his petition. Memorandum says that the Dy Comr Commit miscarriage in the passing order of suspension of his father Venkatappa Vice of Shamboji of Hirenellur & other villages in favour of a dayadi of his.

Pet. complains that the Dy Comr and Taluk authorities moved upon the presumption that his father's name was intentionally changed from Venkatappa to Shamboji while he really did not do so.

The facts of the case are as follows:- Pet's father gave S. No 139 to one Shamboji Hebbadi for entire cultivation on his application & reported the matter to the Taluk Office. In the meanwhile Pet applied for the same land

Hebbadi

Pet

Pet's father was suspended from

Shamboji

Pet's father was suspended from Ajjampura on the 1894 for ten years by Asst Comm Kadur for unauthorized actions made by him in a Dorkhast

Appeal Govt upheld the suspension observing that the Shamboje have been so warned from the service remarking with reference to his request his son might be appointed that the matter was left to the discretion of the Commissioner

Asst Comm thereupon decided against his appointment - A copy of the English order 1894 was furnished to the petitioner on 26.5.96 petitioner now appeals from that order as described - Appeal within time calculated from the date of communication to Asst Comm's order to the petitioner

filed

Filed Rec'd for

6

4-9-96

The Pet's case for the

Where a grave

suspended for

years - for grave irregularities

chief of police in the

alleged Pet is undecided

ment. He does not

complain that the

Govt

[illegible] defining it properly at all.
I think referred to this matter to his
[illegible] who was the chief [illegible] at the
time. His father then reported the
thing. That the same land had been
given to Soma & report made to that
effect to the Taluq. The matter being
settled to the district, the D. C.
passed an order that the landlord
be given to [illegible] which order
was carried out. Soma then
appealed to Govt and on the
requisition of the Govt for the records
connected with the case, the taluq
authorities found out the mistake
alleged to have been [illegible] committed
by his father.

Now Petr urges that his
father has been very unjustly
dealt with by the Taluq & District
authorities and submits that
he has no other means of livelihood.
They have a large family [illegible] to
support & the Petr is well
versed in the Shanbogue work
so that he begs that the Govt may
be pleased to examine the
records and restore the
Shanbogi to them which is the
only means of livelihood.

Petr submits a copy of remarks
of the D. C. Kadur, on Govt Petr:
No 6825 dt 16th Oct 94 which is in English.
P. F. 66-94

1/9/96.
B.d.

left to the direction
of the Deputy Commissioner

27/10/94

27/10
for Chief Secy

W. J. 4/10

No 6884 of 16 Nov 94
Fol: F 4674 Vol.

To The Deputy Commissioner
Kadapa Dist. with the Itre.
record received with his
No 80 of 15 Nov 1894

2 Ver: files

748.

My hon. friend
will give me the
necessary
assurance.

748

(51)

53

L.R. 95.93.9

53

L.R. 95, 93, 4

24-10-96

(10)